

COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN FISH AND WILDLIFE PROGRAM

Guide

to

Fiscal Year 2001

Project

Peer Reviews

in the

Columbia Gorge and Inter-Mountain Provinces

Bonneville Power Administration
Northwest Power Planning Council
Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority
Independent Scientific Review Panel

This guidance was prepared with the assistance of the Independent Scientific Review Panel for use by both project sponsors and proposal reviewers in the Columbia River Fish and Wildlife Program.

July 11, 2000

Contents

Introduction	1
What is a Project Proposal?	1
Who Submits a Proposal?.....	3
Why are Formal Proposals Part of the Fish and Wildlife Program?.....	3
How and When Are Proposals Solicited?	4
How Are Projects Evaluated and Selected?.....	5
1. Administrative Review.....	5
2. Peer Review of the Proposals with Background Material.....	5
3. Project Review Workshop.....	6
4. ISRP Preliminary Report.....	7
5. CBFWA DAIWP and Response to the ISRP Report.....	7
6. ISRP Final Report	7
7. Northwest Power Planning Council Recommendations to Bonneville.....	7
Proposal Preparation	8
Independent Scientific Review Panel Proposal Review Criteria	9
Background	9
Who are the ISRP reviewers?	9
ISRP Proposal Review Criteria.....	10
Additional ISRP Review Elements	12
CBFWA Proposal Evaluation Criteria	16
<u>Anadromous Fish</u>	16
<u>Resident Fish</u>	17
<u>Wildlife</u>	20
Contact Points.....	26

INTRODUCTION

These guidelines are provided to assist and guide individuals or groups preparing projects for funding consideration under the Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program (FWP) for FY2001. As stated in the solicitation letter, this FY 2001 proposal solicitation is limited in geographic scope -- proposals for projects are being solicited for only the **Columbia Gorge and Inter-Mountain provinces**. A description of these province areas, (and the nine others) is found at the Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Foundation website: www.cbfwf.org/province.htm. All projects submitted for consideration must prepare a formal proposal according to these guidelines.

Another change in this year's process is the ISRP's review will expand beyond the anonymous review of proposals to include new elements that will increase the interaction between the reviewers and the project sponsors, and place the review in the projects' geographic context. These new elements include site visits to the province, oral presentations from the project sponsors, a preliminary report by the ISRP, an opportunity for project sponsors to respond to the ISRP's preliminary report, distribution of the ISRP's technical review prior to CBFWA's prioritization of projects, and a final ISRP report. These new elements are described below under the section "How Are Proposals Evaluated and Selected?"

What is a Project Proposal?

A project proposal is a formal description of the work that an individual or group would like to conduct to meet certain objectives of the Fish and Wildlife Program, or respond to Bonneville Power Administration (Bonneville) responsibilities under the National Marine Fisheries Service or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Endangered Species Act biological opinions. Proposed projects need to be consistent with the Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Program that has been adopted by the Northwest Power Planning Council (Council). In addition, documents called "Subbasin Summaries" have been developed in the last few months for each of the major subbasins in the **Columbia Gorge and Inter-Mountain provinces**. These summaries are intended to provide a subbasin scale context for project proposals. Each of those summaries contains a "fish and wildlife needs" section that is intended to provide guidance for the development of proposals. These summaries also include assessment information and management information that should be taken into account in the development of proposals.

The Subbasin Summaries for the Columbia Gorge and Inter-Mountain provinces are available on the Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Foundation website: www.cbfwf.org/province.htm. Copies of these documents are also available upon request from the Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority.

When a proposal is written, the responsibility is on the sponsor to present an idea in a coherent way and to justify its funding. The sponsor must do planning and synthesis

before the proposal is presented. The sponsor should "market" the work in the most compelling way. This requires systematic and disciplined preparation.

A project proposal contains information such as the program objectives being addressed, the nature of the proposed work, methods to be used, the relationships to related work, the qualifications of the individuals and organization to do the work, and costs, all of which are presented in a standard format. The proposal must be sufficiently complete so that competing proposals can be evaluated by independent scientists and regional administrators in a peer review process. The formal written proposal is the administrative record of project plans, the substantive background for the Bonneville Power Administration's Statement of Work and contract, and a basis for subsequent performance reviews of the project.

A proposal communicates to reviewers and decision-makers all the information necessary for them to understand what is being proposed and how it fits in relation to needs for information or action and its relationships to other work.

A proposal justifies why a funding agency should allocate money to this project and to the proposing individual or team. The proposal has to make the case for how this work fits into the larger body of the program, why this is the best approach to the program objectives addressed, and what public benefit will be achieved by funding it. It also needs to show why this is the most appropriate individual or group of people to entrust with the project.

A proposal synthesizes information related to the work. Project sponsors are encouraged to think about the specific questions or actions and how best to present them to people outside their field of specialization. The history of previous research or management actions that logically lead up to the proposed work should be explained clearly. Annual proposals for continuing projects are important bases for monitoring progress, up-dating objectives, and for projecting future budgets. For this review, full and up-dated proposals must be submitted for ongoing and new projects.

The content of all project proposals will be kept confidential by Bonneville until after the deadline for submitting proposals for the province has passed. At that time, copies of the proposals will be made public and will be posted on <http://www.efw.bpa.gov/EW/PROPOSALS/AIWP/2001/ProvincialReview/index.html>, distributed to reviewers, and made available upon request to interested persons. In the event that a project sponsor wishes to protect intellectual property rights contained in a proposal, the project sponsor is free to copyright the proposal or take other appropriate legal steps consistent with this review process. It should be noted, however, that a log identifying proposals received, by title and by sponsor, will be posted on BPA's website prior to the submittal deadline to allow sponsors to track whether or not their proposal has been received.

Who Submits a Proposal?

Submission for funding under the Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program is open to all qualified individuals or groups. All project sponsors, regardless of whether the project is currently ongoing or would be a new project, must follow these guidelines and prepare a formal project proposal for evaluation. All types of projects, whether research, habitat improvement, engineering projects, or operation and maintenance should have clearly written objectives, plans for accomplishing those objectives, budgets, and means for reporting the results. Proposals are the basis for recommending projects for funding.

While it is anticipated that most project proposals will come from sponsors who are seeking funding for themselves to carry out the proposed project, project proposals may also be submitted by sponsors who see a need for funding the proposed activity, but are not interested in carrying out the project themselves. In such instances the project proposal should list the recommended qualifications for those persons who would ultimately be chosen to carry out the project rather than the sponsor's qualifications.

Why are Formal Proposals Part of the Fish and Wildlife Program?

The written proposal is the primary basis by which a project is recommended for continuation or initial funding. Recommendation or rejection will depend on the completeness and persuasiveness of the formal proposal. Information directly explained and referenced in the proposal will form the basis of the funding decision.

Unlike prior years, project sponsors can also submit background reference material for the peer reviewers. These submittals are limited to key technical documents specifically related to the project that are cited and summarized in the proposal form. These documents may include project master plans, monitoring and evaluation plans, watershed assessments, and peer-reviewed articles generated from the project. The background material will be made available for the ISRP reviewers to reference. However, the ISRP and CBFWA will evaluate projects based on the proposal, so all critical information needs to be provided in the proposal.

Review of projects for funding in the Fish and Wildlife Program is accomplished most fairly and effectively when there is a clear and uniform way to propose new or continuing work and a uniformly applied evaluation and recommendation procedure. A primary objective of formal proposals and their review is to attain and maintain a high level of technical quality in the Fish and Wildlife Program. Another objective is to ensure that projects selected for funding demonstrate that agency funds are used wisely and efficiently to meet the program's goals. There is a continuing need for thorough evaluation of the benefits of all prospective new projects and all existing projects proposed to continue, particularly in light of funding constraints and the large number of worthy projects that might be supported.

A stated general goal of the federal government is to significantly enhance the use of peer review in selection of projects for federal funding. For projects funded through

Bonneville Power Administration's fish and wildlife budget, the 1996 Amendment to the Northwest Power Act specifically states that projects shall be peer reviewed for consistency with the Council's program, based on sound science principles, benefit fish and wildlife, have clearly defined objectives and planned outcomes, and provisions for monitoring and evaluation of results. The proposals are the project-specific documents that are reviewed by Peer Review Groups and the Independent Scientific Review Panel mandated by the Northwest Power Act.

How and When Are Proposals Solicited?

Bonneville, with the assistance of CBFWA and the Council, distributes this announcement to known sources and by publication in public documents. The solicitation for proposals in the Columbia Gorge and Inter-Mountain provinces was announced Wednesday, July 12, 2000. ***Full proposals are due by no later than close of business, Wednesday, August 16, 2000.*** This deadline will be strictly enforced and any applications received after this date will not be reviewed for funding consideration in FY2000 unless a specific extension of time is granted by the Northwest Power Planning Council.

Only complete applications will be reviewed. To complete the application process:

- Provide complete answers to every question in the proposal form. These answers should address the ISRP and CBFWA review criteria.
- Save the documents and mail a paper copy and diskette(s) to:

**Bonneville Power Administration -- EW - 4
Attention: Catherine Hanan
FY 2001 Proposals
P.O. Box 3621
Portland, Oregon 97208-3621**

- Please contact the Council offices as soon as possible if you have technical difficulties meeting these requirements.

In addition, although not required, any key technical background material cited and summarized in the proposal may be submitted for the peer-reviewers to reference during their review. The preferred method of submittal is a web address to the document or an electronic copy of the document. If an electronic copy of the document is not available hard copies will be accepted. The reference section of the narrative part of the form provides a location to specify web addresses for the documents. If a web address is not available, electronic copies on diskette(s) or hard copies should be included with the proposal form and submitted by the proposal deadline.

For confirmation that the proposal and background material was received, please check the log file on BPA's website:

<http://www.efw.bpa.gov/EW/PROPOSALS/AIWP/2001/ProvincialReview/index.html>. This log will be updated

daily to reflect proposals which have been received and entered into the tracking system. Please allow 1-2 days for proposals to be entered into the system following receipt by Bonneville. If after that time your proposal is not listed, or you are unable to access the log file, you may telephone Ms. Hanan at (503) 230-2576.

The Council recognizes that the change to the province based format and that prior years' funding recommendations may raise issues about some projects. If you are submitting a project in the Columbia Gorge or Inter-Mountain province and are uncertain how to fill out the enclosed form as a result of these matters, please contact Erik Merrill at the Northwest Power Planning Council at (503) 222-5161 or (800) 452-5161, or by email: emerrill@nwppc.org. If you have other questions about the project proposal form, refer to the Contact Points enclosure included in this package for help in identifying who to contact for assistance.

Sponsors of ongoing projects should also directly contact their project managers at Bonneville's Fish and Wildlife Division for information related to their project.

How Are Projects Evaluated and Selected?

Proposals are evaluated and recommended by a combination of administrative evaluation and professional and scientific peer review. The evaluation occurs in several steps, which are described below.

1. Administrative Review

All proposals are reviewed first to see that they contain the requested information. Lack of completeness of a proposal may be a basis for eliminating the proposal from further consideration. Copies of the entire set of project proposals will be distributed to the ISRP and CBFWA review teams as soon as possible following the close of the solicitation (approximately two days is scheduled for processing). At the same time, this information will be posted on the web at <http://www.efw.bpa.gov/EW/PROPOSALS/AIWP/2001/ProvincialReview/index.html> and updated periodically.

2. Peer Review of the Proposals with Background Material

By August 18th, project proposals for the Columbia Gorge and Inter-Mountain provinces will be distributed to the ISRP and CBFWA review teams. To ensure the most consistent and fair evaluation of proposals, standard formats and criteria are applied to all proposals. These criteria are included below in the "Proposal Preparation" section of these guidelines. At least three ISRP/Peer Review Group members will review each proposal based on the ISRP review criteria and generate comments and scores before the proposal review workshop. These scores and comments will not be made available to the project sponsors at the workshop, but will be used by the ISRP to scope questions for the site visits and workshop presentations.

In addition, at least one ISRP reviewer will be assigned to be familiar with the key technical background material submitted along with the proposal.

3. Project Review Workshop

The project review workshop for the Columbia Gorge province is scheduled for September 11th through 15th; the Inter-Mountain is September 18th through 22nd. The workshop will be split into three stages: 1) Site Visits, 2) Project Presentations, 3) ISRP Evaluation (ISRP only).

Site Visits

The first two days of the workshop (September 11 and 12 for the Gorge and September 18 and 19 for the Inter-Mountain) will be dedicated to a tour of the province by the ISRP and CBFWA review teams. CBFWA will organize the tour in consultation with the ISRP, Council, BPA, and project sponsors. The tour will be arranged to give the reviewers a basic understanding of the ecological conditions in the province so that the projects are placed in their geographic context. In addition, the review teams may visit projects that they feel they need first hand experience of to better understand.

Project Presentations

Project presentations are scheduled for the third and fourth day of the workshop (September 13 and 14 for the Gorge and September 20 and 21 for the Inter-Mountain). Each set of subbasin presentations will begin with a presentation of the subbasin summaries. All project proponents will be given the opportunity to provide a concise presentation on their project. Presentations should address the proposal review criteria including the relation of the proposed project to the subbasin summary. Following each presentation, there will be an opportunity for a question and answer session between the reviewers and the project proponents. Each project will likely be limited to 15 minutes for the presentation, and question and answer session.

All relevant staff should attend. Council, BPA, and CBFWA staffs will also attend the workshop.

Review Team Evaluation Meeting

On the last day of the workshop (September 15 for the Gorge and September 22 for the Inter-Mountain), the ISRP peer review team will meet alone to share impressions of the review, compare results with standard evaluation criteria, and reach consensus on project scores and comments. Findings from the review will be made available in the ISRP's preliminary report.

Note on communication with the ISRP review team: In this year's move to the workshop and response format, ISRP review members will no longer be anonymous. However, it remains important that the reviewers maintain an independent relation with the projects. To help ensure that independence is maintained, any contact with reviewers outside of the workshop and formal response report should go through the ISRP's project coordinator at the Council, Erik Merrill (emerrill@nwppc.org; (503) 222-5161; (800) 452-5161). Any correspondence will become part of the review record.

4. ISRP Preliminary Report

The ISRP is scheduled to provide a preliminary review of the Columbia Gorge and Inter-Mountain provinces on October 6, 2000. This report will include:

- a) an overview of the evaluation, general observations of the match between proposed projects and the subbasin summaries, and overall recommendations on the projects reviewed;
- b) results of standard evaluation criteria to include scores, detailed comments, and, if appropriate, questions for each project in the set.

The report is reviewed and commented upon by all of the team members. All recommendations will be reached by consensus. The report will be presented to the full ISRP for review prior to release.

For the ISRP's past reports and previous comments on ongoing projects go to the Council's website at www.nwppc.org/isrp_toc.htm, especially see ISRP 99-2A.

5. CBFWA Draft Annual Implementation Work Plan and Response to the ISRP's Preliminary Report

Upon release of the ISRP report, project proponents and the public will be given the opportunity to respond to the ISRP's preliminary report. Responses should focus on the ISRP's technical comments, answer any review questions, and clarify any uncertain facts. CBFWA will coordinate the responses as it did in Fiscal Year 2000.

Concurrently, CBFWA, with the ISRP's technical review in hand, will generate a prioritized list of projects recommended for funding and finalize the subbasin summaries as part of its draft annual implementation work plan. By October 28th, CBFWA will release the response report and the draft work plan.

6. ISRP Final Report

The ISRP will provide a second and final report that takes into account project proponents responses, CBFWA's prioritized list of projects, and the relation of the prioritized project to the final subbasin summary. The ISRP will make its recommendations to the Northwest Power Planning Council by December 1, 2000.

7. Northwest Power Planning Council Recommendations to Bonneville.

Finally, based on the advice provided by CBFWA and the ISRP, the Council makes the final selection of annual projects to be recommended for funding and transmits these recommendations to Bonneville by early January 2001. If Council decisions differ notably from recommendations the ISRP, the basis of their decisions is to be documented and included in the Council's final recommendations.

When a project is recommended to Bonneville for funding, the amount budgeted by the Council for the project and the description of the project as recommended by the Council becomes the starting point for Bonneville's contracting process. However, during the course of the contracting process further information, such as a project management plan,

may be required both to establish more specifically the work to be performed and the reasonable cost of that work. The amount of funding ultimately approved by Bonneville for a project may be greater or less than the amount initially budgeted by the Council in its recommendations.

PROPOSAL PREPARATION

What Information Should a Project Proposal Contain?

Project sponsors are able to provide necessary information most effectively when they know the type of information that is desired and the form in which it is preferred. Similarly, proposal reviewers can most efficiently evaluate proposals when all information is in a predictable location. Thus, Bonneville and the cooperating agencies have established a standard format for proposals. Instructions to the form are attached to these guidelines and review criteria. The electronic form is available at:

<http://www.efw.bpa.gov/EW/PROPOSALS/AIWP/2001/ProvincialReview/index.html>

The proposal format is set up for easy preparation using word processing software. This allows proposals to be made available electronically and selected information can be retrieved, sorted, and presented in various formats.

However, proposals should not be written quickly as fragmented responses to blanks in a computer form. In its entirety, the proposal should be a cohesive communications tool, a persuasive justification for the work, a coherent synthesis of relevant information, and a statement of qualifications of the project sponsor. Reviewers will evaluate hard copies of proposals, and will expect to see a logical and thorough presentation of the case for supporting the proposed work.

Independent Scientific Review Panel Proposal Review Criteria

Background

The 1996 Amendment to the Northwest Power Act provides criteria that form the basis of the ISRP review criteria. The amendment states that the ISRP's project recommendations be based on a determination that projects:

1. are based on sound science principles;
2. benefit fish and wildlife;
3. have clearly defined objectives and outcomes;
4. with provisions for monitoring and evaluation of results.

In addition, the ISRP is to review a sufficient number of projects to ensure that the list of prioritized projects recommended are consistent with the Council's fish and wildlife program.

The ISRP's review criteria further define and link these amendment criteria to the proposal form. This linkage allows the reviewers to read the proposal and determine to what extent the criteria are met in each section. **Project sponsors should use the ISRP criteria as a checklist to ensure that their proposal addresses all the criteria and, if not, to describe why a particular criterion does not apply.**

The ISRP criteria apply to all kinds of projects from operation and maintenance of a hatchery to habitat acquisition to gamete preservation research. Some individual projects include several unique strategies. In addition to the general criteria, project sponsors should ensure that their proposal addresses the applicable elements listed after the ISRP review criteria.

Who are the ISRP reviewers?

ISRP and Scientific Peer Review Group members are appointed by the Council, have demonstrated expertise in fish and wildlife biology relevant to the Columbia River, and meet the National Research Council standards for independence and conflict of interest. From the pool of ISRP and Scientific Peer Review Group members, the ISRP will select review teams on the basis of technical knowledge and experience relevant to the projects.

A review team of about six professional peers from the ISRP and Scientific Peer Review Group will review the set of projects in each province. Generally, each review team will consist of three ISRP members and three Scientific Peer Review Group members. At least three reviewers will review each project. The team is chaired by a technical leader with expertise most relevant to projects in the province, usually a member of the ISRP.

Members of the Peer Review Groups may not have a complete knowledge of the histories of ongoing projects or of the need for a proposed new project, except as documented in the proposal and the subbasin summary. For background information on the ISRP visit the Council's website at: www.nwppc.org.

ISRP Proposal Review Criteria

1. Technical and Scientific Background

Is there an identified problem related to fish and wildlife in the Basin? Does the proposal adequately explain (with references) the technical background and logical need to address the problem to benefit fish or wildlife? (0=no explanation; 1=poorly defined problem; 5= adequately defined problem; 10=highly persuasive, clearly defined problem)

SCORE (0-10) _____

2. Rationale and Significance to Subbasin Summary and Regional Programs

Does the proposal demonstrate a clear relationship to specific objectives of the subbasin summary and specific parts of the Fish and Wildlife Program, NMFS Biological Opinions or other plans? (0=no explanation; 1=poorly defined problem, not associated with Programs, 5= significance to subbasin summary and regional plan; 10=well associated with a high priority in a subbasin summary and regional plan.)

SCORE (0-10) _____

3. Relationships to Other Projects

Does the proposal put the work into the context of other work funded in the FWP and described in the subbasin summary? Does this proposal include collaborative efforts with similar projects, even if not part of an overall joint plan? If this proposal is intended as an integrated component of a set of studies, is the rationale for that set and any time sequencing explained and documented? (0=no effort to document or collaborate, 5=minimal linkage or rationale, 10=strong collaborative effort with logical allocation of effort and linkages described, or full rationale why linkages are not appropriate).

SCORE (0-10) _____

4. Project History (for ongoing projects)

Is the history of the project adequately described, including the original need for the project? Does the proposal demonstrate that past actions have resulted in achieving project objectives? Has there been adequate monitoring of project effectiveness? Are these results described in biologically measurable terms and if not does the proposal describe why not and provide other results (e.g. peer reviewed articles)? Does the project describe the adaptive management implications from past results whether successes or failures? Is the continued need for the work justified? Are methods and procedures for collection of past monitoring data (i.e., meta-data) adequately described? Are past results (data, analysis, etc.) adequately communicated or distributed for benefit of the region? (0=no effort to document results; 1=minimal effort to document what appear to be poor results with no description of management implications; 5=some effort to document results, management implications, and some potential for benefits; 10=strong reporting and evaluation of results which have guided project direction with demonstrated or a strong potential for benefits to fish and wildlife.)

NEW PROJECT (SECTION NOT APPLICABLE) _____

SCORE (0-10) _____

5. Proposal Objectives, Tasks, and Methods

A. Objectives

Does the proposal have clearly defined and measurable objectives (whenever possible in terms of measurable benefits to fish and wildlife) with specific timelines? Are the objectives tied to those in the subbasin summary and FWP? (0=no explanation; 1=poorly explained with poor match to subbasin objectives, explained as tasks where could be in biologically measurable terms; 5=adequately explained in terms of measurable benefits to fish and wildlife with match to subbasin objectives and with timelines; 10=clearly explained with close match to subbasin objectives and when possible stated in biologically measurable terms with specific timelines.)

SCORE (0-10) _____

B. Methods

Are the methods adequately described and appropriate, i.e., based on sound scientific principles? Does the project employ the best available scientific information and techniques? Is the project or experimental design reasonable and defensible in techniques and resources? (0=no explanation or scientifically unsound; 1=poorly explained or poor techniques; 5=adequately explained, sound techniques; 10=clearly explained with best available, or even innovative, scientific information and techniques)

SCORE (0-10) _____

C. Monitoring and Evaluation

Does the proposal include provisions for monitoring and evaluation of results (in the context of the objectives) that apply at the project level (whether the M&E is provided in this proposal or a directly related project)? (0=no explanation; 1=poorly explained, will not allow for determination if the project met its objectives; 5=adequately explained and will allow for determination if project met its objectives; 10=clearly explained, will allow for determination of success or failure of the project, inform adaptive management decisions, and be applicable to other efforts)

SCORE (0-10) _____

6. Facilities, Equipment, and Personnel

Are the facilities and personnel appropriate to achieve the objectives and timeframe milestones? (0=no explanation; 1=poorly described or inadequate; 3=reasonable; 5=exceptionally unique personnel and facilities for the work)

SCORE (0-5) _____

7. Information Transfer (see Part I. Section 1 and methods section)

Does the proposal include explicit plans for how the information, technology, etc. from this project will be disseminated and used? Are methods and procedures for collection of monitoring data (i.e., meta-data) adequately described? Are plans for release and long-term storage of data and meta-data adequate? (0=no explanation; 1=poorly explained and inadequate dissemination given the importance of the information generated; 3=adequate plan for the information generated; 5=excellent plan for the information generated, e.g. included in usable format on regional website, peer review journal)

SCORE (0-5) _____

Benefit to Fish and Wildlife (Proposal as a whole)

Will the proposed project benefit target species/indicator populations, as an individual project or as a critical link in a set of projects? Will the benefits persist over the long-term and not be compromised by other activities in the basin? (0=no benefit; 5=likely benefits but short-term; 10=some benefits that will persist; 15=demonstrated significant benefits that will persist over the long-term)

SCORE (0-15) _____

Will the project effect other non-target species? Does the project demonstrate that all "reasonable" precautions have been taken, based on the best available science, to not adversely affect habitat/populations of native biota? (-10=adverse effect and precautions not taken; 0= no adverse effect; or potential adverse effects and adequate precautions proposed; 5=demonstrated benefits to non-target species, habitat, populations.)

SCORE (-10 to 5) _____

TOTAL SCORE: Existing Project _____ of 100 New Project _____ of 90

Consistency with Power Act Amendment Criteria:

- | | |
|---|-----------------------|
| 1) SOUND SCIENCE PRINCIPLES (all proposal) | (YES/NO) _____ |
| 2) CONSISTENT WITH PROGRAM (criterion 2) | (YES/NO) _____ |
| 3) BENEFIT TO FISH AND WILDLIFE (all proposal) | (YES/NO) _____ |
| 4) CLEARLY DEFINED OBJECTIVES AND OUTCOME (criterion 5a) | (YES/NO) _____ |
| 5) PROVISION FOR M&E OF RESULTS (criterion 5c) | (YES/NO) _____ |

Additional ISRP Review Elements

In addition to the ISRP Review Criteria, project sponsors should address the applicable elements listed below. These elements should be addressed fully in the narrative section of the proposal form.

1. Habitat Restoration

Does the proposed project consider the watershed as a whole, regardless of land ownership? Are watershed assessment methods consistent and appropriate to the landscape setting? Have restoration decisions been preceded by a watershed-scale assessment?

Does the proposal provide reasonable evidence that restoration activities will improve factors limiting natural production? Will the proposed activity actually correct a significant limiting factor to natural production? Are steps being taken within the watershed to correct the sources of problems?

Are improvements being proposed for the right location, given the distribution of species of interest? That is, was the project sited correctly relative to the behavior and distribution of the organism(s) of interest?

Does the proposal promote the restoration of natural ecological processes within the watershed?

Does the proposal describe the consideration of passive restoration (e.g., letting the stream or riparian zone restore itself through successional habitat recovery) vs. active restoration (assisting the recovery process through intervention activities such as riparian plantings or instream structure placement).

Does the proposal take existing information into account? Has the full range of watershed uses by stakeholders been documented? How does proposal relate to other restoration efforts within the watershed? Were restoration activities complementary or would there be potential conflicts?

For watershed council proposals, have the appropriate set of regulatory authorities affecting the watershed been identified? Is there a balance of local, state, tribal, and federal participants in the project? Are the full range of watershed interests (stakeholders) represented on the watershed council?

Do proposed activities contain measurable objectives? Have criteria for success been specified? Is the monitoring plan appropriate to the project, and adequately staffed and funded? Are methods and procedures (meta-data) for collection of monitoring data adequately described? Where are monitoring data and meta-data stored and how are they made available to the public?

2. Information Dissemination/Systemwide Databases

Does the proposal clearly describe how its results will be communicated (or have been communicated) to other researchers (through reports, symposia, or peer-reviewed publications), to fisheries managers, and to higher-level policy makers and administrators? Does the proposal clearly describe what is being communicated to the public? If the purpose is to make data available, are the data reasonably current and/or in a form that can be easily viewed and downloaded?

Does the proposal describe the mechanism for assuring quality control over the information/data being given to the public?

Does the proposal describe that the public demand and needs for information has been assessed?

Does the proposal describe how many people will receive the information, e.g., number of hits on a web site?

Does the proposal describe what changes in behavior or outcomes are anticipated to result from the information?

Does the proposal guarantee that methods and procedures for collection of data (that is, meta-data) are or will be available to users?

What methods will be used to monitor and evaluate the project, i.e., to assess the impact of the information? Is the monitoring plan appropriate and adequately staffed and funded? Are methods and procedures (meta-data) for collection of monitoring data adequately described? Where are monitoring data and meta-data stored and how are they made available to the public?

3. Operation and Maintenance

Is the history of the project adequately described, including the original need for the project? Are the objectives clearly stated?

Is the budget justified and reasonable?

How well has the project performed in achieving its objective? Is the monitoring plan for this project appropriate and adequately staffed and funded? Are methods and procedures (meta-data) for collection of monitoring data adequately described? Where are monitoring data and meta-data stored and how are they made available to the public?

Are evaluations of past monitoring data provided? Where are evaluations published? Hard copy reports? Web sites?

Is the need for continuing the work justified?

4. Construction

Is there a clear description of the need for the project, including the expected benefits relative to the costs of construction and long-term maintenance?

Does the proposal describe the approval steps already taken and received prior to the request for construction funds?

Does the proposal describe the qualifications of the builders, and what contingencies have been included to prevent excessive cost overruns?

Is the construction schedule reasonable and does it include provisions for delays?

5. Research

For ongoing projects, is progress to date adequately described so that the next steps are clear? Is the project proceeding as proposed; if not, is there an adequate justification for any changes, deviations, etc? What reports and peer-reviewed publications are available?

Is the project or experimental design reasonable and defensible in techniques and resources? Are the methods adequately described and appropriate, i.e., based on sound scientific principles?

Are tasks aligned specifically to meet objectives?

Are there adequate provisions for monitoring and evaluating the results in the context of stated objectives? Are methods and procedures (meta-data) for collection of data adequately described? What are the provisions for release and long-term storage of data and meta-data? When will data and meta-data be released?

Is the proposed schedule reasonable for the work to be carried out?

6. Implementation and Management

Does the project employ the best available scientific information and techniques?

If this is an ongoing project, what is the evidence of project success? Is the monitoring plan appropriate to the project, and adequately staffed and funded? Are methods and procedures (meta-data) for collection of monitoring data adequately described? Where are monitoring data and meta-data stored and how are they made available to the public?

Do other alternative approaches exist and how have these been evaluated in deciding on a course of action?

Have unwanted side-effects of proposed activities been considered and accounted for?

Why should BPA, and not another organization, fund the project

7. Wildlife Habitat Acquisition

Has the need for acquiring the property in question been justified, e.g., through gap analysis? Has there been a clearly demonstrated need for acquiring more of this type of habitat, as opposed to other types? Will habitat improvement measures be necessary to achieve the desired wildlife values? If so, does the proposal adequately describe those measures, their timeframe, and an associated monitoring and evaluation protocol needed to assess the habitat improvement actions?

Has the property being considered for acquisition been surveyed to determine what habitat types exist?

What wildlife species will benefit from the acquisition? Will there be benefits to fishery resources as well?

Does the proposal clearly explain the acquisition process and whether the property will be dedicated to a wildlife reserve in perpetuity?

Is the monitoring plan appropriate to the project and adequately staffed and funded? In addition to the HEP procedures for monitoring of the number of habitat units made available, what specific wildlife and habitat survey methods are in place to verify benefit to the target species? To non-target species? Are methods and procedures (meta-data) for collection of monitoring data adequately described? Where are monitoring data and meta-data to be stored and how will they be made available to the public?

Is the cost reasonable?

**Project Proposal Evaluation Criteria of the Anadromous Fish, Resident
Fish, and Wildlife Committees of the Columbia
Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority**

Anadromous Fish

Technical Criteria

1. Does the proposal demonstrate that the project uses appropriate, scientifically valid strategies or techniques and sound principles?
2. Are the objectives clearly defined, measurable, and achievable?
3. Is the project likely to meet or is it currently meeting its objectives and time frame milestones?
4. Are the resources proposed (staff, equipment, materials) appropriate to achieve the objectives and time frame milestones?

Management Criteria

1. Does the proposal use key strategies and actions to achieve measurable objectives that address documented problems and limiting factors as identified in strategic plans (e.g., Multi-Year Plan, Subbasin Plans, *Wy-Kan-Ush-Mi Wa-Kish-Wit* etc.)? Identify the specific management plan referenced in the proposal.
2. Does the proposal promote and maintain sustainable normative ecosystem processes, community diversity, and species richness?
3. Is there a cost share for the construction, implementation, operations and maintenance of the project?
4. Will the project complement management actions on private, public, and tribal lands and does the project have demonstrable support from affected agencies, tribes, and public?
5. Were other alternatives considered?
6. Will the project provide data critical for in-season, annual, and/or longer term management decisions? (to be used for Mainstem and Systemwide projects only).
7. Were the technical deficiencies identified by the NTWG adequately addressed?
8. Is the project urgent, or more urgent?

Resident Fish

Screening Criteria

A proposed project must meet all of these criteria to be considered further.

1. Project addresses specific Council Program measures. (Yes / No)
2. Project developed to meet particular program measures must be consistent with management objectives of the agencies or tribes which have jurisdiction. (Yes / No)
3. Project addresses one of the priorities listed on page 10-3 of the Sept. 13, 1995 NPPC Fish and Wildlife Program). (Yes / No)
 - Accord highest priority to rebuilding to sustainable levels weak, but recoverable, native populations
 - Accord second highest priority to resident fish substitution measures in areas that previously had salmon and steelhead, but where anadromous fish are now irrevocably blocked by federally operated hydropower development.
 - Accord high priority to measures that meet the following criteria (not in rank order):
 - Provide benefits for wildlife and/or anadromous fish.
 - Develop biological or integrated rule curves that will protect resident fish in storage reservoirs.
 - Protect the health of existing resident fish populations.
 - Other native stocks that may be at risk due to the construction and operation of the FCRPS.
 - Demonstrate that they do not adversely affect native resident or anadromous fish.
 - Address biological objectives that have been adopted by the Council.
 - Give preference to measures that address losses at hydropower facilities for which an assessment of losses and gains is approved and completed by the Council.
 - Substitution measures in areas that previously had salmon and steelhead, but where such fish are now permanently blocked by federally licensed or regulated hydropower facilities.

Technical Criteria

1. Does the proposal demonstrate that the project uses appropriate, scientifically valid strategies or techniques and sound principles? (Yes / No)
2. Are the objectives clearly defined and measurable and are tasks aligned to the objectives? (Yes / No)
3. Are the resources proposed (staff, equipment, materials) appropriate to achieve the objectives and time frame milestones? (Yes / No)

4. Does the proposal include monitoring and evaluation of the results (in the context of the objectives - including performance measures/methods) at the project level? (Yes / No)

Ongoing Projects: A specific monitoring plan is in place, the results have been evaluated and the evaluation guides the project direction.

New Projects: The proposal includes a specific detailed monitoring and evaluation plan which links project objectives to expected results.

5. Will the proposed project significantly benefit the target species/ indicator populations? (Yes / No)

Project provides direct benefits to target species/indicators populations.

6. Does the proposal demonstrate that project benefits are likely to persist over the long-term and will not be compromised by other activities in the basin? (Yes / No)

Proposal clearly describes the long-term picture. Supporting documentation clearly demonstrates that activities within the basin complement each other.

7. Demonstrates that all “reasonable” precautions have been taken, based on best available science, to not adversely affect habitat/populations of native resident and anadromous fish. (Yes / No)

8. Is the short and long-term budget (including planning, construction, operations and maintenance, and monitoring and evaluation) appropriate and cost-effective to achieve the objectives, tasks and time frame milestones? (Yes / No)

The budget (short and long-term) is carefully prepared and related directly to the specific objectives, tasks and schedules. The staff, materials and equipment are appropriate.

9. Are there explicit plans for how the information, technology etc. from this project will be disseminated or used? (Yes / No) (ISRP C IV-3)

Specific transfer plans included in the proposal.

Programmatic Criteria

The Resident Fish Caucus could use these programmatic criteria to evaluate projects.

1. Does the proposed project address fish and wildlife-related strategies, needs and actions as identified by the resources managers (e.g. CBFWA DAIWP MYIP Section 6, Loss Assessments, Mitigation Plans, Watershed Assessments, Subbasin Plans, and the Council’s Program)? (Yes / No)

The proposal addresses (including adequate technical information and references) strategic needs, critical assumptions, measurable objectives, and stated performance standards.

2. Does the project address an urgent requirement or threat to population maintenance and/or habitat protection? (Yes / No) (BCH C-8)

Population and habitat is in serious time frame jeopardy such that failure to act immediately will result in a significant loss.

3. Does the project promote/maintain sustainable and /or ecosystem processes? (Yes / No) (WS C 4-9)
4. Does the project promote or maintain desirable community diversity? (Yes / No) (WS C 4-4)

The proposed project contributes significantly and directly to species diversity and richness.

5. Provides for an important fishery that does not target or adversely affect a weak but recoverable native stock (e.g., consumption, subsistence, cultural, recreation)
 - Target fish population provides important fishery (e.g., consumption, subsistence, cultural, recreation).
 - Some of the targeted fish populations provide important fishery.
 - Target fish population does not provide important fishery.
6. Does the proposal put the project into the context of other work funded in the FWP? Does it include collaborative efforts with similar projects, even if not part of an overall joint plan? If this proposal is intended as an integrated component of a set of projects, is the rationale for that set and any time sequencing explained and documented? (Yes / No) (ISRP C III)

Strong collaborative effort with logical allocation of effort and linkages described or a full rationale of why linkages are not appropriate.

7. Is there cost-share for the construction/implementation, and/or monitoring and evaluation of the project? (Yes / No) (WS C 4-5)
8. Is continued funding required to achieve project objectives? (Yes / No)

Wildlife Criteria

The following definitions and weighting factors assigned to Wildlife Mitigation Criteria were developed by the Northwest Power Planning Council.

Program Consistency - Threshold Questions

- A. Is the project based on and supported by the best available scientific knowledge? (Response must be supported by answers to questions 3, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13.)
- B. Is the project biologically possible? (Response must be supported by answers to questions 3, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13.)
- C. Are there any state, federal or local laws, ordinances, executive orders which would prevent this project from coming to fruition?
- D. Does this project impose on Bonneville the funding responsibilities of others, as prohibited by the Northwest Power Act?
- E. Is the proposed project consistent with, or does it complement the activities of the region's state and federal wildlife agencies and Indian tribe(s)? (Identify agency/tribe affected.)
- F. Does the project have measurable objectives, such as Habitat Units and/or species response to actions planned?

Ranking Criteria

- 1. **Be the least costly way to achieve the biological objective.** Project presentation must identify and separate costs for preplanning, acquisition, enhancement, operation and maintenance for a five year period. Project presentation should also discuss enhancement (development) plans, site potential, and the anticipated minimum number of Habitat Units by target species that would result from implementation of this project.

Points: 0 = Less cost effective
 1 = Comparable costs
 2 = More cost effective

- 2. **Encourage the formation of partnerships with other persons or entities, which would reduce project costs, increase benefits, and/or eliminate duplicative activities.** Beyond general community support, the extent to which evidence presented shows this project demonstrates efficiencies and/or reduces costs through documented use of matching funds, volunteers, donations, signed cooperative agreements or signed memoranda of understanding, (includes tribal lands if dedicated in perpetuity for wildlife mitigation and if credit is given to BPA for enhancements).

Points: 0 = No evidence presented.
 .5 = Letter of interest is documented.
 1 = Letter of commitment is documented.

3. **Provide riparian or other habitat that may benefit both fish and wildlife (for resident and anadromous fish.)**

Points: 0 = No benefits to fish.
 1 = Incidental benefits to fish.
 2 = Substantive benefits to fish.

4. **Address concerns over additions to public land ownership and impacts on local communities, such as reduction or loss of local government tax base, special district tax base, or the local economic base; or consistency with local government or tribal governments' comprehensive plans.**

Points: 0 = Does not demonstrate tangible effort to address concerns.
 1 = Does demonstrate tangible effort to address concerns.

5. **Immediacy of Threat.** The extent to which evidence (documented) shows that acquisition of this site is necessary to protect the site from an identified threat. Documentation is defined as (but not limited to): a letter, a picture, or a news article, which clearly shows the property is on the market for sale, rezoning or regulations are pending, property is being subdivided, or timber/mineral rights are for sale.

Points: 0 = No evidence presented or minimal threat; target feature(s) appear to be in no immediate danger of loss in quality, (e.g. could be partially protected by zoning, regulation or voluntary measures)
 1 = Actions are under consideration which could result in the target feature(s) losing quality. (Must be documented.)

6. **Use publicly owned land for mitigation, or management agreements on private or tribal land, in preference to acquisition of private land, while providing permanent protection or enhancement of wildlife habitat.**

Points: 0 = Does not utilize easements or publicly owned land.
 1 = Utilizes a mixture of fee title acquisition and easements or public lands.
 2 = Project can be completed using management agreements, easements and/or public lands.

7. **Mitigate losses in-place; in-kind, where practical.** Out-of-kind mitigation is not acceptable for impacts to habitat for: endangered, threatened, sensitive or candidate species. When out-of-kind mitigation is being proposed, the sponsor must identify the proposed species or habitat type substitution. Project must also identify the target species and which hydroelectric facility(ies) will be credited with mitigation. Air miles (from anywhere on the pool) are used to calculate distances.

Points: 0 = Off-site (more than 100 miles) and out-of-kind.
 1.0 = Off-site (more than 100 miles) and in-kind.
 1.5 = Off-site (50-100 miles) and in-kind.

2.0 = On-site (within 50 miles) and in-kind.

2.5 = On-site (must be adjacent to impact area) and in-kind.

8. **Address special wildlife losses in area that formerly had salmon and steelhead runs that were eliminated by hydroelectric projects (for example, societal and tribal wildlife losses).** Criteria contains two factors and therefore receives points for both rating factors:

A. *Dam causing impact: (identify dam)*

Points: 0 = No blockage of existing anadromous fish.
 .5 = Blocks anadromous fish, but tribe in the area still has access to anadromous fishery.
 1.0 = Blocks anadromous fish. Tribe in region does not have access to anadromous fishery.

and

B. *Mitigation project proposed:*

Points: 0 = Does not mitigate for tribal losses.
 1 = Addresses tribal losses.

9. **Address achieving the Council's mitigation priorities (See Attachment B).** The purpose of this question is to determine how closely the proposed project matches the NPPC's mitigation priorities. To score the project, use the following example: The proposed project has: (Determined by Attachment A)

45% High priority habitat	= 4.5
25% Medium priority habitat	= 2.5
30% Low priority habitat	= 3.0

Points: High = .3 points
 Med = .2 points
 Low = .1 point

Scoring:	High priority habitat	= 4.5 X .3 Points	= 1.35
	Medium priority habitat	= 2.5 x .2 Points	= .50
	Low priority habitat	= 3.0 x .1 Point	= <u>.30</u>
	Total Score	=	2.15

10. **Protect endangered, threatened, and sensitive species.** The extent to which evidence presented supports significant occurrence of threatened, endangered status, and/or sensitive, fish and wildlife species. Sponsor must demonstrate the relationship of the proposed project to key life history attribute of the species; e.g., breeding, wintering, feeding, resting and migration.

The site exhibits significant occurrences of:

- Points:
- 0 = No species listed in state or federal policy, or listed species is an occasional visitor.
 - 1 = One species listed threatened or sensitive in state or federal policy.
 - 2 = One species listed endangered in state or federal policy.
 - 3 = More than one species listed threatened, endangered or sensitive.

11. **Protect high quality, native or other habitat.** (Habitat Quality) The extent to which evidence presented establishes that the area is among the best representatives of this type for the target species. The intent of this question is to determine the quality of habitat of a site compared to other sites of the same type. Consider quality and extent of cover, key structural elements, species composition, water, food sources, human disturbance, etc.

- Points:
- 0 = Marginal quality. High number of vegetative intrusions and/or degradation present compared to others of same type. This site exhibits low quality and will require restoration. OR Land to be managed to support vegetation or habitat not existing there naturally (i.e. planting of ornamental vegetation, creation of artificial impoundments, water control structures).
 - 1 = Moderate quality. Vegetative intrusions and/or degradation are present. Will require some restoration (i.e. the majority of the property was intensively used). Property is degraded but has moderate potential for rehabilitation.
 - 2 = Average quality. Property is degraded but has high potential for rehabilitation.
 - 3 = Good quality. No significant vegetative intrusions found. Site is among the best regional representatives of this type (i.e., existing habitat is near optimum stage and exhibits signs of past disturbance). May require some restoration.
 - 4 = Excellent quality. No significant vegetative intrusions found. Site is among the best state representatives of this type.

12. **Uniqueness of Habitat Types.** The extent to which evidence presented shows this project is unique. This can be based the rarity of the site's key elements or on the project size (i.e. the whole drainage or an "ecosystem") or distribution and status of its key elements. For scoring purposes, protected is defined as public/tribal land owned and managed exclusively for, and accessible to, wildlife OR land which through zoning, regulation or voluntary measures is not in danger of a loss in habitat quality and is accessible to wildlife.

- Points:
- 0 = Ordinary. The elements or types are widely distributed across the region and several examples are protected.
 - 1 = Unusual. Poor distribution and few examples are protected.

13. **Connectivity**. The extent to which evidence presented establishes that acquisition or management of this site will benefit or be benefited by other protected lands. Protected is defined as public or tribal land managed exclusively for, and accessible to, wildlife OR land which through zoning, regulation, or voluntary measures is not in danger of a loss in habitat quality and is accessible to wildlife.

- Points:
- 0 = No or marginal connectivity. Generally, the area does not relate to existing protected area/protected watershed.
 - 1 = Moderate connectivity. The site will modestly enhance an existing protected area/protected watershed.
 - 2 = Good connectivity. The site provides an important ecological corridor to at least one other protected area/watershed.
 - 3 = Excellent connectivity. The site is an important ecological corridor to an especially important protected area/protected watershed (consider total size if multiple sites are involved).

14. **Long-term management potential**. (Protect or enhance natural ecosystems and species diversity over the long term.) The extent to which evidence presented shows the overall site (core and key buffer tract(s)) can be managed over the long term and still protect the target species. Consider site size, location, and buffers (to withstand surrounding human activities and invader species). A buffer increases protection of adjacent core site values by screening it from outside impacts and improving manageability. Target features surrounded by numerous protected and undeveloped acres tend to resist most threatening forces than features surrounded by developed acres.

- Points:
- 1 = Marginal protection. On a long term basis, core and/or buffer areas are probably too small/poorly located to withstand existing or future incompatible activities on neighboring lands (e.g., timber harvesting, high density developments etc.).
 - 2 = Average protection. Buffers/size/location are probably large enough to withstand existing or future incompatible activities on neighboring lands.
 - 3 = Excellent protection. Buffers/size/location will definitely foil significant incompatible outside influences.

Wildlife Mitigation Project Ranking Criteria
Relationship To NPPC Program Principles

	NPPC Program Reference	
THRESHOLD QUESTIONS:		
A. Best scientific knowledge	Power Act	
B. Biologically possible	Power Act	
C. Laws preventing project implementation	11.2D.1	#11
D. Impose funding respons. of others to BPA	11.2D.1	#9
E. Consistent with state, fed, tribal	11.2D.1	#7
F. Measurable objectives	11.2D.1	#2
SOCIAL/ECONOMIC:		
1. Least cost	11.2D.1	#1
2. Partnerships	11.2D.1	#8
4. Public land/impacts to local economy	11.2D.1	#11
6. Use of public land vs acquisition	11.2D.1	#12
8. Wildlife losses in blocked areas	11.2D.1	#10
BIOLOGICAL MERIT:		
3. Provides riparian benefits for fish	11.2D.1	#4
7. In-place, In-kind	11.2D.1	#5
9. NPPC mitigation priorities	11.2E.1	
10. Protect T,E, and S	11.2D.1	#3
11. Protect high quality habitat (includes potential to restore high-quality habitat)	11.2D.1	#3
12. Uniqueness of habitat types	11.2D.1	#3
13. Connectivity	11.2D.1	#7
LOGISTICS:		
5. Immediacy of threat	Power Act	
14. Long term management potential	11.2D.1	#6

References

Beak Consultants, Inc. February 1993. Audit of Wildlife Loss Assessments for Federal Dams on the Columbia River and its Tributaries.

BPA, March 1997. Wildlife Mitigation Program Final Environmental Impact Statement.

CBFWA, June 1997. Draft Multi-Year Implementation Plan.

CBFWA Wildlife Caucus, May 1998. Enhancement, Restoration, Operations and Maintenance of Columbia Basin Wildlife Mitigation Projects.

NPPC, September 1995. Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program.

Bonneville Power Administration

Fish and Wildlife Program FY2001 Proposal Forms

Contact Points

Use the following reference list to determine the most appropriate source of information if you need assistance or have questions while completing the proposal form.

Question or Problem	Contact
Need a form, guidance documents, instructions, or criteria	a) All materials are posted on BPA's website at http://www.efw.bpa.gov/EW/PROPOSALS/AIWP/2001/ProvincialReview/index.html b) Eric Schrepel at (503)274-7191 or eric@cbfwf.org
Problems using the form, questions regarding form mechanics, or other technical questions related to use of the form itself	Eric Schrepel at (503)274-7191 or eric@cbfwf.org
Application of ISRP criteria	Erik Merrill at (503)222-5161 or (800)452-5161; emerrill@nwppc.org
Application of CBFWA criteria	CBFWA at (503)229-0191
Confirmation that proposal has been received	Check the log file at http://www.efw.bpa.gov/EW/PROPOSALS/AIWP/2001/ProvincialReview/index.html
Seeking an exemption from the deadline of August 16, 2000	Note: Exceptions are <u>extremely</u> rare and require extraordinary circumstances. Erik Merrill at (503)222-5161 or (800)452-5161; emerrill@nwppc.org
Need assistance or information to complete budget tables, especially regarding NEPA, construction, PIT tags, etc. or other tables within the form	For on-going projects, contact your BPA COTR
Need information regarding Council's FY00 decisions	a) Erik Merrill at (503)222-5161 or (800)452-5161; emerrill@nwppc.org b) Council's website at www.nwppc.org
Need information regarding ISRP's findings in FY00	c) Erik Merrill at (503)222-5161 or (800)452-5161; emerrill@nwppc.org

	d) Council's website www.nwppc.org/isrp_toc.htm
Misplaced last year's proposal and would like to use it for reference	BPA website at www.efw.bpa.gov/Environment/EW/PROP/OSALS/AIWP/2000/index.html
Need explanation of subbasin summaries	Erik Merrill at (503)222-5161 or (800)452-5161
Newly approved FY00 proposal that doesn't have a BPA project number yet	Catherine Hanan at (503)230-2576
Don't understand a particular question or table within the form	Erik Merrill at (503)222-5161 or (800)452-5161
Other procedural questions	Erik Merrill at (503)222-5161 or (800)452-5161